

Remarks**Claim Objections**

Claim 19 has been corrected as requested by the Examiner. The Examiner's attention to this detail is appreciated.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11, 13-18, 22 and 23 as being clearly anticipated by Foladare US 5,907,547. This is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Foladare does not teach the following features of the independent claims:

a) "each of the web pages being associated with pre-specified information about potential calls"

b) "selecting one of the web pages using information about the call."

In the present invention an end user is able to store customised web pages each associated with pre-specified information about potential calls. For example, a user may store a web page for provision to family members, another for customers and another for new enquiries. When the end user initiates or receives a call, information about that call is obtained and used to select an appropriate one of the stored web pages. The selected web page is then provided to one of the call members. The web pages can be stored on a web server or on the end user's terminal used to take part in the call (such as a mobile phone).

The situation in Foladare is quite different. In Foladare a customer who is browsing a web site is able to request a call back from a customer service representative. The customer requests the call back by clicking on a specific button on the web site. This downloads a notification applet to the customer's browser which monitors the incoming traffic to the customers browser. When the customer representative becomes available, a notification packet is sent to the

customer's browser and is detected by the notification applet which pops up a window asking if the customer is happy to accept the callback from the customer service representative. The advantage of the notification applet is that it allows the customer to go off browsing other web sites while they are waiting for a customer service representative to become available. If they accept the call back then, a data link is setup between the customer's browser and the customer service representative's browser so that the customer service representative can push web pages to the customer. In addition, a phone call is also set up from the customer service representative to the customer.

Thus in Foladare the web pages display a merchant's catalog. These web pages are not associated with pre-specified information about potential calls. The Examiner states that this feature is taught in Foladare at column 2 lines 65-67; column 3 lines 1-28, 4-67; column 4 lines 1-7 and column 6 lines 9-27. However these passages have been carefully studied. They describe on-line access of a catalog provided by a merchant on a server. This access can be via web pages using a world wide web protocol link. The notification applets mentioned identify the web server and this is not "pre-specified information about potential calls". Some of the web pages have a "call me" button and neither is this "pre-specified information about potential calls"; rather it is a user interface means. Therefore it is not understood how the Examiner finds anticipation of this claimed feature in Foladare. If the Examiner maintains this rejection please would the Examiner explain this point in more detail.

The Examiner states that "selecting one of the web pages using information about the call" is taught in Foladare at column 2 lines 10-17; column 3 lines 31-67; column 6 lines 9-29 and column 8 lines 19-34. Again, those passages have been very carefully studied but they do not describe "selecting one of the web pages using information about the call". In Foladare the customer service representative can push web pages to the customer to make a sales presentation but this does not involve selecting one of the web pages using

information about the call. Also, the customer can select web pages by browsing the catalog. Again this is not selecting web pages using information about the call.

Each of the independent claims 1, 13, 17, 19 comprise these two features which are not taught in Foladare. Independent claim 22 is directed to a telephone terminal having web pages each associated with information about potential calls. This is not taught in Foladare for the same reasons. This also applies to Independent claim 23 directed to a web site.

The dependent claims are also not anticipated by Foladare by virtue of their dependency. With respect to dependent claim 9 the Examiner states that Foladare teaches the customer representative storing web pages sent by the client and that this reads onto "storing a second plurality of web pages which are to be provided on behalf of the first call member". This is respectfully rejected. In Foladare the customer does not send web pages. The customer simply browses web pages provided on the merchant's server. In Foladare there is only one plurality of web pages that being the merchant's catalog.

With respect to dependent claim 10 the Examiner states that the client sends the customer representative information and that this reads onto "said pre-specified information about potential call members". This is respectfully traversed. In Foladare there is no pre-specified information about potential calls that is associated with the web pages.

With respect to dependent claim 11 Foladare does mention sending the client's directory number to the customer representative to make a 'call back'. However this directory number is not "pre-specified information about potential calls" that is "associated with each of the web pages".

With respect to dependent claim 15, nowhere in Foladare are java servlets mentioned. The Examiner's statement that Foladare teaches the feature of claim 15 is traversed.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103


The Examiner rejects claims 12 and 19-21 as being unpatentable over Foladare in view of either Khouri or DeBoor. This is respectfully rejected because none of those references describe the two claimed features mentioned above as a) and b).

The Examiner's arguments about the remaining dependent claims are also not correct in view of the above.

Further and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2004



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935

Barnes & Thornburg LLP
PO Box 2786
Chicago IL 60690-2786
(312) 357-1313 Telephone
(312) 759-5646 Facsimile
(312) 214-4811 Direct